

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 294

EC 123 589

AUTHOR Evenson, Jill S.; Cook, Judy Thompson
 TITLE A Nationwide Survey on Participation of Handicapped Students in Experience-Based Career Education.
 INSTITUTION Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
 SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
 PUB DATE Nov 79
 NOTE 57p.; Some pages are marginally legible may not reproduce well: For related information, see EC 123 590
 AVAILABLE FROM Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, EBCE Project, 1855 Folsom St., San Francisco, CA 94103 (\$5.00 limited supply)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; Community Involvement; Demography; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Exceptional Child Research; *Experiential Learning; National Surveys; *Program Evaluation
 IDENTIFIERS *Experience Based Career Education

ABSTRACT

A national survey of Experience Based Career Education (EBCE) programs was conducted to determine the extent to which one model of a career development program, EBCE, is meeting the needs of handicapped students and to create awareness of this information among educators and program developers. Responses were obtained for 173 programs. Five types of programs emerged: (1) emphasis on the general population, not enrolling special needs students (N=36); (2) emphasis on the general population, enrolling special needs students, handicapped students included (N=46); (3) emphasis on the general population, enrolling special needs students, no handicapped students (N=28); (4) emphasis on special needs students, handicapped students included (N=18); and (5) emphasis on special needs students, no handicapped students (N=45). Special needs students included gifted, disaffected, migrants, poverty level, or youth status offenders. Data were also collected on the kinds of EBCE programs enrolling handicapped students: categories of handicapped students served by EBCE; kinds of community activities involving handicapped students; characteristics of EBCE programs serving the handicapped (such as percentage of handicapped students enrolled, program structure, and staff and student responsibilities); and staff perceptions of EBCE program feasibility for serving the handicapped. Findings included that of the 56 EBCE programs serving the handicapped, 70% provide at least some required academic credit for EBCE activities and all had completely individualized curricula. Survey instruments are appended. (SBH)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED184294

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A NATIONWIDE SURVEY ON PARTICIPATION OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS in EXPERIENCE-BASED CAREER EDUCATION

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Lenneth W.
Horne*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

EC123589

(W) FAR WEST LABORATORY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
1855 FOLSOM STREET - SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103 - (415) 565-3000

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, and no official endorsement by these agencies should be inferred.

A NATIONWIDE SURVEY ON
PARTICIPATION OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS
IN EXPERIENCE-BASED CAREER EDUCATION

by

Jill S. Evenson
Judy Thompson Cook

November, 1979

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report is one of a series of papers concerning special applications of Experience-Based Career Education prepared under the direction of Robert Spotts, manager of research in experience-based learning at Far West Laboratory. Mr. Spotts' critique of instrumentation and paper drafts and his overall guidance at each stage of the work were essential to the successful completion of the study.

The information presented in this report was developed largely through telephone interviews with representatives of high-school EBCE programs. Their cooperation was remarkable and is genuinely appreciated.

The efficient preparation of the draft and final manuscript was accomplished by Jane Szabo.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODOLOGY	
Instrumentation.	3
Data Collection.	3
Respondents.	4
SURVEY RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	
What kinds of EBCE programs enroll handicapped students?	6
How many EBCE programs serve handicapped students, and what categories of handicapped students do they serve?	9
In what kinds of community activities are these handicapped students involved?	12
To what extent do EBCE programs which serve handicapped stu- dents vary on fundamental program parameters?	15
What are staff perceptions of the feasibility of serving handicapped students through EBCE programs?	22
SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS	
Summary of Findings.	29
Implications for Future Research	32
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.	34
APPENDICES	
Appendix 1 - EBCE National Directory Revision, 1979	36
Appendix 2 - Participation of Handicapped Students in EBCE	43

TABLES

	Page
Table 1 - Characteristics of ERCE Programs Grouped by Emphasis on Handicapped Students	7
Table 2 - Categories of Handicapped Students Enrolled in ERCE	11
Table 3 - Ages of Handicapped Students in ERCE	12
Table 4 - Characteristics of Student Learning Activities	13
Table 5 - Characteristics of EBCE Programs Enrolling Different Percentages of Handicapped Students	17
Table 6 - Characteristics of Students in EBCE Programs Enrolling Different Percentages of Handicapped Students	18
Table 7 - Staff and Student Planning in ERCE Programs Enrolling Different Percentages of Handicapped Students	21
Table 8 - ERCE Program Changes and Adaptations Cited as Necessary To Serve Handicapped Students	23

INTRODUCTION

An increasing societal concern for the quality of life of exceptional individuals is reflected in new educational policy and in programs better preparing these persons for a variety of life roles. Programs are encouraging career development activities that enable handicapped students to learn to function in occupational and avocational roles according to their own needs and abilities. It is now recognized that, in addition to job-skills training, handicapped students need, and are entitled to, opportunities to develop other skills and attitudes necessary for a productive adult life.

One way that the career development of handicapped students can be enhanced is through exposure, as part of their school curriculum, to practical experiences in work settings in the community. These experiences bring students increased awareness of career options, growth in self-sufficiency, and realistic feedback in the context of one-to-one relationships with adult workers. One educational program which provides these community experiences is Experience-Based Career Education (ERCE).

ERCE is an alternative (full- or part-time) program that integrates academic learning and career exploration through direct, planned experiences in a wide variety of employer and other community settings. Through completely individualized curricula, the program stresses the development of basic skills and life skills as students explore their own interests and abilities. In addition to learning projects completed with the assistance of community resource persons, students develop basic skills by means of workshops, tutorials, or (in the case of a part-time program) regular classroom work.* The ERCE model, judged exemplary by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (whose members

*See Selected Bibliography for a list of documents pertaining to ERCE.

represent the U.S. Office of Education and the National Institute of Education), is now being disseminated nationally. Although ERCE was originally developed to serve the general population, it is now being used widely with special-needs students, including those with disabilities.

This paper is one of a series of studies investigating the use of the Experience-Based Career Education model to facilitate the career development of handicapped students. Previous research has investigated the potential of EBCE for providing handicapped students with opportunities to develop critical life skills (Evenson, Spotts, and Perencevic, 1979) and the feasibility of mainstreaming handicapped students into EBCE (Evenson and Spotts, 1979). Results of these studies indicate that the needs of many handicapped students for career exploration and community involvement can be met by EBCE.

The purposes of the present study are (1) to determine the extent to which one model of a career development program, Experience-Based Career Education (EBCE), is meeting the needs of handicapped students and (2) to create awareness of this information among educators and program developers. The survey was designed to elicit answers to five general questions:

- What kinds of EBCE programs enroll handicapped students?
- How many EBCE programs serve handicapped students, and what categories of handicapped students do they serve?
- In what kinds of community activities are these handicapped students involved?
- To what extent do EBCE programs which serve handicapped students vary on fundamental program parameters?
- What are staff perceptions of the feasibility of serving handicapped students through EBCE programs?

These answers will provide information as to how this particular model is being used and, in addition, will address the more general concept of using experiential learning programs to improve the quality of life of exceptional individuals.

METHODOLOGY

This section discusses instruments used to obtain answers to the five questions listed above, data collection procedures, and the respondents contacted.

Instrumentation.

Two instruments were used:

(1) "EBCE National Directory Revision, 1979." This survey asked local EBCE program directors for information on the community setting, principal features, enrollment, and special funding for their programs. It also identified programs serving handicapped or other special-needs students. (See Appendix 1 for directory questionnaire.)

(2) "Participation of Handicapped Students in EBCE." This questionnaire was designed by the present authors to measure (a) program commitment to serving handicapped youth, (b) parameters of programs serving handicapped students, (c) the amount of participation in EBCE activities by handicapped students, and (d) staff perceptions of program adaptations and areas of success or concern regarding handicapped students in EBCE. Program commitment and student participation were measured by objective questions; staff perceptions were identified through open-ended questions. (See Appendix 2 for a copy of "Participation of Handicapped Students in EBCE.")

Data Collection

The "EBCE National Directory Revision, 1979" was sent nationwide to all known EBCE programs (Spotts and Hampson, 1979), and directors who did not respond by mail were telephoned. Those programs indicating that they serve handicapped students were asked later to respond to the "Participation of Handicapped Students in EBCE." All of this smaller set of programs were

contacted by the same person (one of the present authors), and all interviewing was done by telephone. For each program, the person interviewed was either the program director or someone directly involved with EBCE, such as a learning coordinator or field-site coordinator. (In several cases the original contact referred the interviewer to a new program director or to someone more intimately acquainted with the EBCE program so that responses would more accurately reflect program activities and staff perceptions.)

Respondents

Responses to the "EBCE National Directory Revision, 1979" (which provided data related to question one) were obtained for 173 programs. As part of the survey, respondents were asked to categorize the emphasis of their programs as (1) serving the general population but not enrolling special-needs students, (2) emphasizing the general population but also serving special-needs students, or (3) enrolling special-needs students primarily or totally. They also indicated categories of special-needs students (such as handicapped, gifted, disaffected, migrants, poverty-level, or youth status offenders) served by their program. Responses from these two items enabled a categorization which distinguishes programs which serve handicapped students from those which do not. Five program types emerged from the data:

- (1) Emphasis on the general population, not enrolling special-needs students (N=36);
- (2) Emphasis on the general population, enrolling special-needs students, handicapped students included (N=46);
- (3) Emphasis on the general population, enrolling special-needs students, no handicapped students (N=28);

- (4) Emphasis on special-needs students, handicapped students included (N=18); and
- (5) Emphasis on special-needs students, no handicapped students (N=45).

Of these five program types, the second (N=46) and the fourth (N=18) together include all EBCE programs serving handicapped students, either primarily or along with the general population. Representatives of all of these 64 programs answered the "Participation of Handicapped Students in EBCE" questionnaire, which provided data related to questions two through five.

Of the 64 programs queried, eight were omitted from data analysis. Two of the programs are not as yet implementing an EBCE model: One of these is still in the planning stage and, when implemented, will serve handicapped students exclusively with a projected enrollment of about 50; the other now offers a career exploration class for some of its 75 handicapped students and will select 15 of these students for community-based activities later in the school year. Two other programs have not served any handicapped students as yet, but indicated that they will serve any who enroll. Another EBCE program (currently inactive for lack of funds) had served only one special education student whose experience was limited to occasional field trips; this marginal involvement precluded the director's completion of the questionnaire. A sixth program has been subsumed by another EBCE program which is included in the data analysis. Finally, two programs were omitted because they, unlike the other programs contacted, do not serve high school students. One of these primarily serves college students and other young adults; the other, though its clientele includes a large handicapped population, serves adults ages 21-55 and involves paid employment.

In summary, 173 EBCE programs responded to the directory revision questionnaire. Of these, 64 indicated that they serve handicapped students; representatives of all 64 programs responded to the second questionnaire. Eight of these 64 programs were omitted from data analysis. Analysis of data from the remaining 56 programs provided answers to questions about serving handicapped students in EBCE. These 56 programs include those which serve high school-aged students (some of which additionally serve younger or older students) and which presently serve and/or have served handicapped students.

SURVEY RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents results of the two questionnaires as they relate to each of the five questions asked in the introduction and includes discussion of those findings.

I. What kinds of EBCE programs enroll handicapped students?

The 173 programs responding to the "EBCE National Directory Revision, 1979" were categorized into the five types listed on pages 4-5. Table 1 (page 7) shows the relationships between the five program types and the particular characteristics brought out by the survey. It reveals that among the programs for the general population, those accepting special-needs students usually served handicapped students (46 of 74). That is, if they accepted some students with special needs, then they ordinarily did not exclude handicapped students. These mainstreamed programs also were very likely to serve gifted (37 of 45) and to a lesser extent certain other special-needs students. The remaining 28 programs (emphasis on the general population, not enrolling handicapped) were usually directed toward gifted or disaffected students (or both), and may well have used EBCE as a new curriculum to motivate and stimulate these young people.

TABLE 1
Characteristics of EBCE Programs Grouped
by Emphasis on Handicapped Students

Program characteristics	Program enrollment				
	Mainly or totally general population			Mainly or totally special-needs students	
	No special- needs students N = 36	Some special-needs students including handicapped N = 46	Some special-needs students--no handicapped N = 20	Handicapped and others N = 18	No handicapped N = 45
Special-needs groups served (other than handicapped) *					
CETA - eligible		23	12	7	29
Gifted		37	19	3	9
Disaffected		18	18	5	15
Status offenders		16	5	6	12
Unemployed/dropouts		11	6	6	13
Teenage pregnant and parents		13	5	5	8
Migrants		5	1	1	5
Age groups accepted *					
Elementary	1	0	1	2	0
Middle/jr. high	6	5	2	4	10
High school	32	45	28	17	36
Post high school/adult	1	4	1	2	7
Fidelity					
Close replication	14	23	15	3	7
Substantial modification	22	23	13	15	38
Credit awarded					
Career exploration and basic skills	7	19	1	7	18
Career exploration and academic credit	29	27	27	11	27
Proportion of total curriculum					
Part of curriculum only	24	24	15	11	34
Full-time or full-time option	12	22	13	7	11
Length of program					
One year or less	20	16	11	8	20
More than one year	16	30	17	10	24
Amount of special-purpose funding					
None or only some of total funding	24	25	21	3	12
Most or all of total funding	12	21	7	15	33

Conversely, the 63 sites classified by the directors as emphasizing special needs were not predominately programs for handicapped students. (It should also be noted that one EBCE program for the mildly mentally disabled with several sites was reported as a whole rather than listing each site separately, thereby reducing the number of programs listed in this category.) Out of the 45 special-needs programs not including handicapped youths, most (29 of 45) served CETA-eligible* students; in fact, many were CETA-funded. Special educators might be interested in knowing that while 71 EBCE programs reported accepting CETA-eligible students, only 30 of these stated specifically that they enrolled those with handicaps (although all handicapped students are now CETA-eligible).

The directory questionnaire collected information on several variables related to the community setting of programs (population, family income, family mobility, and ethnic diversity in the district). Findings suggest that community setting was not a major factor in determining the types of students served by EBCE.

On the other hand, some differences were found in program structure and content related to the five enrollment patterns, as shown in Table 1. Fidelity (the extent to which the site reproduced the model upon which it was based) was one consideration. Close replications tended to be found in programs serving the general population but also open to other students; those emphasizing special populations were usually more highly adapted. EBCE is flexible; programs can often incorporate handicapped students without undergoing substantial change, or major adaptations can be made where useful to meet the unique needs of special students.

*The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (CETA) supports programs for vocational and educational skills development of poverty-level and other high-risk youth.

II. How many EBCE programs serve handicapped students, and what categories of handicapped students do they serve?

Programs Enrolling Handicapped Students. Enrollment data were analyzed for the 1979-1980 school year (this year) and for the previous 1978-1979 school year (last year). Also included in the data analysis for last year were handicapped students who were enrolled in these programs prior to the 1978-1979 year, as was the case for a few programs.

Of the 56 programs investigated, 52 enrolled handicapped students last year. Forty-one of the 56 have handicapped students enrolled this year. To obtain a clearer picture of the overlap in enrollment between last year and this year, the 56 programs were further categorized as follows:

- (1) Programs which began operations this year and do enroll handicapped students (N=3);
- (2) Programs which started enrolling handicapped students this year (N=1);
- (3) Programs which enrolled handicapped students both last year and this year (N=37);
- (4) Programs which enrolled handicapped students last year but have not this year (N=11); and
- (5) Programs which enrolled handicapped students last year but which have been cancelled (N=4).

Inasmuch as the telephone survey was done in October of 1979, during the first few weeks of school, it seemed likely that some of the 11 programs in category four (above) simply had not yet enrolled any handicapped students. When asked about the likelihood of enrolling such students later in the year, six of these program representatives said it was likely, two said it was unlikely, and three did not know. If the six that considered it likely do, in

fact, enroll handicapped students later in the year, that would bring to 47 the number of EBCE programs serving the handicapped population this year, as compared to 52 doing so last year.

Categories of Handicapped Students Served by EBCE. Table 2 (page 11) presents the number of programs serving handicapped students by each of nine disability categories and the number of students in each category enrolled in EBCE. Figures are given for this year and for last year. As seen in Table 2, mentally retarded (MR) students and those with specific learning disabilities (LD) comprise a large majority of the handicapped students enrolled in EBCE. It should be noted that, in these two categories, some programs serve only a few students while others serve many (one program, for example, is serving 28 LD and 86 MR students).

Of the handicapped students enrolled in EBCE so far this year, 375 are male and 259 are female; last year, 244 were male and 186 female. The male and female percentages of the total handicapped population remained about the same from last year to this year (males, for example, comprised 57% and 59% respectively).

Handicapped students in EBCE high school programs range in age primarily from 14 through 18, with only a few students above 18 and even fewer under 14. As seen in Table 3 (page 12), the majority of these students were 15, 16, or 17 years old when they were in EBCE. (When actual ages were not available, figures were based on respondents' estimates.)

Table 2
Categories of Handicapped Students Enrolled in EBCE

Category	Year			
	1979-1980		1978-1979	
	Programs N = 41*	Students Served	Programs N = 52*	Students Served
Learning Disabled	24	170	25	103
Mentally Retarded	17	393	23	273
Emotionally Handicapped	6	17	5	9
Orthopedically Handicapped	6	11	12	21
Hearing Handicapped*	5	22	4	8
Visually Handicapped	1	1	2	3
Speech Handicapped	1	5	2	8
Multihandicapped	5	15	4	4
Other Health Handicapped	0	0	1	1
Total students served		634		430

*Total frequency exceeds the number of programs because a program may serve more than one type of student disability.

Table 3
Ages of Handicapped Students in EBCE

Age	Number of Students	
	1979-80 School Year	1978-79 School Year
Below 14	0	2
14	36	16
15	153	82
16	190	130
17	153	148
18	73	42
Above 18	29	10
Total	634	430

III. In what kinds of community activities are these handicapped students involved?

Several telephone-survey questions concerned the activities in which handicapped students in EBCE were engaged. These questions and responses to them are presented in Table 4 (page 13). The EBCE curriculum emphasizes career awareness through experiences in the community, so these questions sought to determine the extent to which handicapped students have opportunities for these experiences and the kinds of credit available to them for community activities.

As seen in Table 4, 93% of the respondents said that all or nearly all handicapped students have some kind of community experience. Regarding career exploration, 98% of the programs offer field trips to business or other organizations to all handicapped students, and 93% have all of these students involved in short visits with an individual at the workplace.

Table 4
Characteristics of Student Learning Activities

Item	Programs	
	f	%
1. How many of your handicapped students will have experiences in the community through EBCE?		
All or nearly all	52	93
Some	4	7
Hardly any or none	0	0
2. What opportunities will your handicapped students have to explore careers in the community?		
Field trip or visit to an organization:		
Some or most students	1	2
All students	55	98
Short visit with a person at his/her workplace:		
Some or most students	4	7
All students	52	93
Longer, planned projects with resource persons:		
No students	1	2
Some or most students	9	16
All students	46	82
3. In your EBCE program do students, including handicapped students, visit community sites in:		
Large groups	14	25
Small groups of three or four	13	23
Pairs	4	7
Individually	56	100
Which mode of visit has the most emphasis in your program?		
Individual only	29	52
Mostly individual	22	39
Mostly group, some individual	5	9
4. Is each handicapped student's learning program individualized to his or her particular needs?		
Yes	56	100
No	0	0
5. What kind of credit is available to handicapped students?		
Career exploration only	8	14
Career exploration and basic skills	0	0
Career exploration and elective academic credit	9	16
Career exploration, elective, and some required academic credit	39	70
6. For handicapped students, how do the opportunities in your EBCE program to develop life skills compare with those of other programs in your district enrolling handicapped students?		
Greater opportunity in EBCE	48	86
About the same opportunity	7	12
Less opportunity	1	2

As a central element in the EBCE curriculum, students do planned projects in which they are involved with one person in the community for a longer period of time. Eighty-two percent of the programs reported that all handicapped students had the opportunity (and/or will have the opportunity in the 1979-80 school year) to do these planned projects; only one program reported that no handicapped students engage in such projects.

All 56 program representatives reported that their handicapped students engage in community activities on an individual basis. Fifty-two percent of the programs used only the individual mode, while another 39% primarily used individual activities but also involved handicapped students in group visits. When used, group activities usually involved field trips or short visits at the workplace, with most lengthy projects done on an individual basis.

Referring again to Table 4, all programs have (or had) individualized learning programs for handicapped students, a fact that is not surprising since EBCE itself is built on the concept of completely individualized curricula. Seventy percent of the programs give career exploration, elective, and required academic credit to handicapped students for community activities; in some other programs, students can receive career exploration and/or elective credit but receive no academic credit. (Respondents indicated that credit assignment is determined by local and/or state policy for all EBCE students; in each program, handicapped students have the opportunity to earn the same kinds of credit as do students from the general population.)

The EBCE philosophy assumes that through community experiences students will, in addition to gaining career awareness, develop life skills, such as self-reliance and decision-making ability. Eighty-six percent of the respondents said that the EBCE program presented more opportunities for handicapped students to develop life skills than did the students' previous programs; 12% said EBCE provided about the same opportunity as previous programs. Many of

the 86% offered the comments that EBCE provided much more opportunity in this area and that this was, in the words of one respondent, "...the most significant benefit handicapped students receive."

IV. To what extent do EBCE programs which serve handicapped students vary on fundamental program parameters?

In contrast to the general agreement among respondents about student activities, there were several important parameters on which they tended to differ. These differences were primarily in the areas of percentage of handicapped students enrolled, of program structure, and of staff and student responsibilities.

Differences among Programs in the Percentage of Handicapped Students Enrolled. An important difference among programs was that of the percentage of handicapped students enrolled. Low-percentage programs, with no more than 10% of their enrollment being handicapped students, accounted for half of the 56 programs. There were 15 moderate-percentage programs having between 11% and 40% handicapped students in their total enrollment. The remaining 13 programs enrolled a high-percentage of handicapped youngsters -- more than 40% of their students were handicapped -- and tended toward almost exclusive enrollment of handicapped students.*

*An original four category classification was reduced to three categories (as defined above) after studying the groupings. The original scheme proposed a category between 11% and 33% and another between 34% and 67%. However, only three programs were located in the latter category. One of these, with 40% handicapped students, was described as serving the general population plus special-needs students; it was added to the former category by extending the range from 33% to 40%. The other two programs, described as serving special-needs students only, were incorporated into the high-percentage category (revised to over 40%), thereby reducing the number of categories to three.

There appear to be two, and perhaps three, separate trends in extending ERCE to handicapped students. At one end of the distribution are a number of low-percentage programs each serving only a few handicapped students, while at the other end are a few high-percentage programs serving many of them. The low-percentage programs are mainstreaming all types of handicapped high school students into the general population. The moderate-percentage programs are harder to delineate. While many of them are also examples of mainstreamed programs, they appear to have a special interest in enrolling handicapped students and might also enroll other special-needs students.

Program Structure. Table 5 (page 17) presents five dimensions on which ERCE programs might differ. The table shows the distribution on these variables for the total group of 56 programs as well as for each of the three enrollment percentage levels. Considerable variation among programs is noted and should be considered representative of the kind of variation possible in adapting ERCE to meet local needs. Some are replications, following closely the original ERCE model (23 programs), while others show varying degrees of adaptation. The programs with a high percentage of handicapped students are the most highly adapted; only one of these programs was considered a replication. As a group, the programs with a moderate percentage of handicapped students were more likely to offer full-time programs and to allow students to enroll for more than one year. Overall, the majority of the programs were part-time (35 of 56), served the general population (42 of 56), and reported much special funding (32 of 56).

The 1978-1979 and 1979-1980 enrollment figures for handicapped students in ERCE are shown by Table 6 (page 18). Programs with 10% or less of their enrollment by handicapped youngsters (i.e., mainstreamed programs) are providing

Table 5
 Characteristics of EBCE Programs Enrolling
 Different Percentages of Handicapped Students

Item	Programs			Total N=56
	Percentage of Handicapped Students			
	10% or less N=28	11- 40% N=15	More than 40% N=13	
Fidelity to original EBCE model				
Replication	12	10	1	23
Some adaptation	10	3	7	20
Substantial adaptation	6	2	5	13
Emphasis on special-needs groups (e.g., CETA, Disaffected)				
General population, some special-needs	28	13	1	42
Special needs plus some general	0	2	3	5
Special needs only	0	0	9	9
Funding				
Little special funding	6	7	2	15
Some special funding	5	4	0	9
Much special funding	17	4	11	32
Proportion of students' time spent in EBCE program				
Part time	21	6	8	35
Full or part time	2	6	4	12
Full time	5	3	1	9
Length of time student allowed to remain in program				
One year or less	11	2	5	18
Two years or less	10	7	1	18
More than two years	6	6	6	18
Other	1	0	1	2

Table 6

Characteristics of Students in ERCE Programs
Enrolling Different Percentages of Handicapped Students

Item	Programs			Total N=56
	Percentage of Handicapped Students			
	10% or less N=28	11- 40% N=15	More than 40% N=13	
1979-1980 School Year				
Number of programs serving students (as of survey date)	18	11	12	41
Number of students				
Learning disabled	15	37	118	170
Mentally retarded	47	24	322	393
Physical, sensory handicaps	14	4	16	34
Other (e.g., emotionally disturbed, speech impairment, multihandi- capped)	13	2	22	37
Total	89	67	478	634
Mean age of students 14-18 years	16.25	16.75	16.01	16.12
1978-1979 School Year				
Number of programs that served students	28	14	10	52
Number of students				
Learning disabled	11	42	50	103
Mentally retarded	26	75	172	273
Physical, sensory handicaps	23	9	0	32
Other (e.g., emotionally disturbed, speech impairment, multihandi- capped)	14	7	1	22
Total	74	133	223	430
Mean age of students 14-18 years	16.36	16.76	15.97	16.28

services to students with all types of disabilities. Enrollment in these programs is intermittent; of the 28 mainstreamed EBCE programs operating during 1978-1979, only 18 had any handicapped students enrolled during the first few weeks of the 1979-1980 school year.

The handicapped population of programs with a high percentage of these youngsters, in contrast to that of mainstreamed programs, is comprised almost entirely of mentally retarded (MR) students and/or students with learning disabilities (LD). High-percentage programs serve relatively few students with other handicaps. Though they most frequently serve MR and LD students, it should be noted that, in 1979-1980, a few high-percentage programs are concentrating on students with other disabilities, such as hearing impairment or emotional disturbances.

The mean age of handicapped students (often derived from respondents' estimates) differs across the three percentage categories in Table 6. Handicapped youth in programs enrolling a low or moderate percentage of handicapped students are likely, on the average, to be somewhat older than those in programs enrolling a high percentage of handicapped youth.

Responsibility of Staff and of Handicapped Students for Planning. A previous study of four program plans for implementing EBCE with handicapped students (Evenson and Spotts, 1979) indicated that one way in which programs may differ is the implementation and planning style of the program staff. This question was investigated in the present survey. When 52 respondents chose between two alternatives describing planning style, 34 agreed with the statement, "Little preplanning, can accept students and make necessary adaptations as we go along," while 18 indicated that they incorporate, "Thorough preplanning, almost everything worked out before accepting students." Overall, then, about 65% of the respondents favored (or at least engaged in) the ad hoc approach.

The first item of Table 7 (page 21) shows a strong relationship between planning style and the percentage of handicapped students in the program. As the percentage of handicapped students increased, the program was more likely to emphasize a preplanned, rather than an ad hoc, approach.

Opportunities for students to plan and make arrangements to carry out learning activities are considered an important part of the EBCE approach to learning. To ascertain whether handicapped students have these opportunities, respondents were asked three questions about decision-making and responsibility in EBCE and, in each case, were required to choose between the categories "mostly staff" and "mostly student." Although this was not always an easy choice, respondents were able to choose one alternative in all but one instance.

As shown in Table 7, results indicate a division of opinion among the 56 representatives. To the question, "Who makes the decisions about what activities will be in a handicapped student's learning program?", 60% of the respondents said that the student had the major role. As to arranging a student's visits to community sites, 48% of the respondents saw it as a student responsibility and 52% saw it as a staff responsibility; 61% of the programs gave the student primary responsibility for arranging transportation to and from sites.

Table 7 shows a relationship between decision-making/responsibility and the percentage of handicapped students in the program. Programs enrolling a high percentage of handicapped students (primarily mentally retarded or learning disabled) were more oriented toward staff decisions and responsibility. The 15 programs enrolling between 11% and 40% handicapped students appeared to provide the most opportunity for handicapped students' decision-making. It should be noted that these programs tended to enroll older students and to provide a more extensive curriculum than did programs in the other two categories.

Table 7

Staff and Student Planning in EBCE Programs
Enrolling Different Percentages of Handicapped Students

Item	Programs							
	Percentage of Handicapped Students						Total	
	10% or less N=28		11-40% N=15		More than 40% N=13		N=56	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Amount of staff preplanning								
Little preplanning	22	79	9	60	3	33	34	65
Thorough preplanning	6	21	6	40	6	67	18	35
No response							4	
Decisions about student's activities in program								
Mostly staff	11	39	5	36	6	46	22	40
Mostly student	17	61	9	64	7	54	33	60
No response							1	
Responsibility for arranging student's visits to community sites								
Mostly staff	15	54	4	27	10	77	29	52
Mostly student	13	46	11	73	3	23	27	48
Responsibility for arranging transportation to community sites								
Mostly staff	11	39	5	33	6	46	22	39
Mostly student	17	61	10	67	7	54	34	61

V. What are staff perceptions of the feasibility of serving handicapped students through EBCE programs?

Respondents were asked to discuss necessary program adaptations, staff concerns, and particular successes regarding serving handicapped students in EBCE.

Necessary Program Changes and Adaptations. Table 8 (page 23) presents the number and percent of programs citing various adaptations in the EBCE program which are seen by local staff as necessary to serve handicapped students. Adaptation of materials used by students was cited most frequently; these usually concerned the reading level of the material which, in many cases, had to be lowered to meet the needs of MR or of LD students. Almost half of the respondents said that more advance work with community resources is necessary to insure successful placement of handicapped students. The resource analyst must be sure that these students will be accepted by the organizations in which they may work and must assure the students' safety, particularly in situations involving machinery. Several respondents indicated that handicapped students generally require more staff time than do students from the general population.

For some programs, transportation arrangements to and from community sites are more of a problem with handicapped than with other students. In general, those who mentioned this adaptation indicated that their districts do not make buses available to the EBCE program.

Where curriculum changes were necessary, it often involved more testing of handicapped students at the beginning of the program and an increase in the amount of training necessary before visits to community sites. Where mentioned, supplementary personnel referred to academic tutors or, in the case of hearing impaired students, to tutors and interpreters. As seen in Table 8, other changes were mentioned by less than ten percent of the respondents.

Table 8

ERCE Program Changes and Adaptations Cited
As Necessary To Serve Handicapped Students

Program Changes and Adaptations	Programs	
	f*	%
Material adaptations	30	54
More advance work with resources	24	43
More staff time per pupil	17	30
Transportation arrangements	10	18
Curriculum changes	9	16
Supplementary personnel	8	14
Staff must reduce expectations	4	7
Staff additions and/or changes	3	5
Physical facilities change	3	5
Staff coordination necessary	2	4
Other	3	5

*Total frequency is greater than number of programs because respondents could give more than one response.

Staff Concerns Regarding Handicapped Students in EBCE. All respondents indicated that they are personally committed to serving handicapped students in EBCE; however, they did name several areas of concern. In response to a separate open-ended question, staff concerns, in some cases, mirrored the adaptations and changes discussed above. For example, transportation for the handicapped was a problem for 11 respondents, several of whom said that transportation is their only problem. These programs either do not have sufficient funds to transport the handicapped students, or their present transportation cannot handle immobile students. Eleven program directors indicated that they need additional staff to serve effectively handicapped students. Some of these programs need more full-time credentialed staff; others need money to hire tutors or to provide interpreters for deaf students. One respondent noted that, "Staff additions are necessary to change the teacher/pupil ratio." Similarly, seven respondents saw serving the handicapped as being more time-consuming than serving the general population. As the time requirements increase, additional staff are needed to serve both handicapped students and those from the general population. To mainstream effectively, more time is required to prepare the handicapped students for community work and (according to two respondents) to supervise them at field sites.

The solutions to the concerns cited above all imply, at least in part, the need for additional funds. Nine respondents specifically mentioned lack of money as a major concern. One respondent was very specific, saying, "Handicapped students in alternative programs do not have the access to funds they would if they were in traditional school programs. Money should be earmarked for handicapped students in EBCE if the staff additions necessary for a successful program are to be made." Another respondent noted that, "The public may not be aware of why it takes more money to serve kids with special needs."

Another area of concern is that of placement of handicapped students at community sites. Five respondents cited community acceptance as a potential problem, although three of these said they had experienced no real problem as yet. Two respondents said that placement of severely impaired students was difficult, while two others noted that placement was difficult only because they are in a small town with few community resources. Four programs were concerned with liability for handicapped students' safety at field sites. One respondent had found that the complicated machines used at sites (in a highly industrial community setting) proved too difficult for some handicapped students to operate. Addressing the need for community acceptance, one program director said, "The community is emphathetic, but it may not be aware of the extent of help and time it takes to have a program of this type. Schools must continue to articulate the program's needs to business and industry."

While a few respondents mentioned potential problems with acceptance of handicapped students, data indicate that, according to past experience, it has not been a problem. Responses to a question regarding acceptance of handicapped students by resource persons and by other students were positive. On a four-point scale, 73% rated community acceptance as excellent (four) and 25% rated it as good (three). When asked about acceptance of handicapped students by peers from the general population, 66% of the 44 persons responding rated it as excellent, and 32% rated it as good. (The latter question was not applicable to programs which served handicapped students exclusively.)

Concerns regarding EBCE[®] staff were expressed by five respondents. Two cited staff resistance to mainstreaming, and three cited the need for increased staff orientation. "Staff members need to see themselves as learning coordinators rather than as traditional teachers," and staff training is needed to, "...break down resistance to mainstreaming." Lack of administrative support (in terms of attitude, rather than of funds) was a concern of two respondents.

Three other concerns were articulated. The need for modified and/or supplementary materials was noted by three respondents. One learning coordinator was concerned that insufficient time was given to developing the handicapped students' basic skills. Another respondent cited a difficulty in program evaluation resulting from the inability to separate the influence of confounding variables.

The remaining concerns focused on the handicapped students themselves. Two respondents noted that the lack of traditional structure in the EBCE program is a problem for some handicapped students who have become passive and who have little self-discipline. One person expressed concern for the emotional well-being of handicapped students, whom he perceived as being especially vulnerable in the EBCE milieu. One program director, who saw EBCE as potentially of great benefit to these students, wanted to be sure that all handicapped students who might profit from EBCE be identified and placed in the program.

Staff Perceptions of EBCE Program's Success with Handicapped Students. With the exception of a very few whose programs were just beginning, respondents named at least one (and in many cases several) areas of success with handicapped students. Though difficult to categorize systematically, these responses warrant discussion, as they indicate the extent to which the EBCE curriculum is successful in meeting the special needs of handicapped students.

Fourteen respondents cited students' enhanced self-concept as an important result of the EBCE experience. Handicapped students learn that, "Lack of success in school does not equal lack of success in life," and that, "I'm not a failure." Five respondents noted that EBCE gave these students the sense that they are not "different" but can get out into the world like everyone else. "Students learn to accept themselves and to see that everyone is handicapped in some way."

The largest number of responses in any one category (15) concerned the growth in life skills, such as independence, self-reliance, and responsibility. The handicapped students, "...were given responsibilities and carried them out." One respondent cited an independent evaluation, the results of which indicated significantly more growth in life skills than had occurred in the handicapped students' previous programs. Improvement in the students' communication skills was cited twice. Five additional respondents said that the EBCE program encourages active, rather than passive, behavior and that it helps handicapped students move away from their "learned dependence" toward more independent action. This new-found independence gives these students the feeling that, "I can cope in the world."

Eleven respondents said that exposure to the community brought the greatest success to handicapped students. "Students have realistic opportunities to see what work is like, rather than reading about it in a textbook." This gives them the opportunity to find out what they can do, rather than what they can't do (nine respondents) and to form a more "realistic self-assessment" (two respondents). The recognition students receive from cooperative, sensitive community resource persons was noted by five additional respondents. This community exposure allows handicapped students to, "...find that they can do things they never thought possible before. The kids got excited by this."

Growth in career awareness was cited by five respondents as a successful aspect of EBCE for handicapped students. The students became aware of jobs in which they could be successful, based on experience at community sites. One program director pointed out that, according to a validated check list, handicapped students showed significant growth in career maturity during their year with EBCE. Four other respondents noted that EBCE experience resulted in subsequent job placement for handicapped students. One director of a program

serving handicapped students exclusively reported that, "Employment following the EBCE program was high." Following another program, two mentally retarded students got full-time jobs in the organization in which they did EBCE projects.

Three respondents saw acceptance of the handicapped students by others as an important aspect of the EBCE program; two of these cited small-group guidance sessions as leading to self-acceptance and to acceptance by other students. Two respondents saw the completely individualized nature of EBCE as most helpful to handicapped students. Another praised the practical application of school-based knowledge as the biggest success of the program, saying, "These kids, who have never been outside the school before, had the opportunity to get experiences in the community that they would never get otherwise." According to one respondent, this experience gives the student more direction in life.

Success from the standpoint of the EBCE staff was also noted. One respondent said, "The communication between special education teachers and the EBCE staff has been very positive." Another pointed out that EBCE provides a systematic curriculum for teachers who want to work with handicapped students in an experience-based program.

To summarize the answers to Question V, EBCE staff appear to see serving handicapped students through EBCE as quite feasible. Though adaptations to the program may be necessary, the nature of the EBCE program is such that, despite these changes, the benefits of the program to students are not lost. The list of staff concerns indicates a realistic assessment on the part of people in a program which involves some philosophical and behavioral change. Despite these concerns, the program successes cited (as well as the general tone of the interviews) shows that EBCE can be quite effective in this special application.

Of the 56 respondents, none questioned the validity of using EBCE with the handicapped. All felt that, given enough time, energy, and money, the program can effectively meet educational needs of handicapped students.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary of Findings

This nationwide survey used two questionnaires to determine the extent to which Experience-Based Career Education (EBCE) is serving handicapped students. Of the 173 EBCE programs described in the 1979 Directory, 137 specified that they attend to at least one special-needs group; of these 137, 56 have enrolled handicapped students over the last two years. During the 1978-1979 school year, 52 programs enrolled 430 handicapped students, and the beginning of the present (1979-1980) school year found 41 programs serving over 600 such students.

These 56 EBCE programs differ in the percentage of handicapped students that they enroll; they can be arranged into three groups. In the low-percentage group are those which mainstream 10% or fewer handicapped students into a program serving the general population. Moderate-percentage programs enroll between 11% and 40% handicapped students. Those programs whose enrollment includes more than 40% (some of which are composed entirely of) handicapped students are classified as high-percentage programs.

Half (28) of the programs fall in the low-percentage group. Enrollment of handicapped students in these programs is often intermittent; ten of the 28 that served such students last year did not yet have any enrolled at the start of the current school year. In contrast to programs in the other two categories, which are composed almost entirely of learning disabled and mentally retarded students, this group of low-percentage programs enrolls students with many different kinds of disabilities (including physical, sensory, and emotional

handicaps). Perhaps because of the variety of handicapped students that might enroll and the fact that only a few students were in a program at any one time, this group of programs is the most likely to use an ad hoc, rather than a thoroughly preplanned, approach to mainstreaming into EBCE. Most (22 of 28) enroll a handicapped student and then, using the capacity of EBCE for shaping individualized programs, establish a suitable learning program around the student's needs. A greater percentage of programs in this group than in the high-percentage group encourage student participation in choosing and arranging for their learning activities. Low-percentage programs are frequently short-term and/or part-time, and most are closely patterned to the original EBCE model.

EBCE programs having a moderate percentage of handicapped students tend to enroll slightly older such students and to be available for a greater proportion of the students' school day than do those in the low- or high-percentage groups. They are also the most likely of the three program types to be full replications of the original EBCE model (10 of 15) and the least likely to have extensive special funding. Like the low-percentage programs, they emphasize service to the general population (13 of 15), but their handicapped population is primarily learning disabled or mentally retarded. Nine of the 15 moderate-percentage programs favor an ad hoc approach to enrolling handicapped students. This group of programs is the most likely of the three categories to encourage the students' lead and responsibility in selecting and planning learning activities; students, rather than staff, generally have major input as to their own learning activities and have primary responsibility for arranging community visits and transportation to sites.

The high-percentage programs enroll most of the handicapped students in EBCE in situations where from 40% to 100% of students are handicapped. These students are primarily either mentally retarded or learning disabled (222 of

223 last year and 440 of 478 this year). These programs are designed to serve special populations, and 12 of 13 are moderate to substantial adaptations of the EBCE model on which they were based. All but two programs secured special funding. As a group, they rely on thorough preplanning before enrolling the handicapped students, as would be expected given their student population. The high-percentage programs are more likely than low- or moderate-percentage programs to give staff a greater role than students in deciding and arranging for students' learning activities and community site visits. Because of the adaptations necessary to serve large handicapped populations, some of these programs are developing and utilizing special EBCE curricula. Only one of these programs can be classified as full-time, but half of them allow handicapped students to remain in the program for two years or longer. The mean age of handicapped students in high-percentage programs is slightly lower than that of those in low- or moderate-percentage programs.

Though the 56 EBCE programs serving handicapped students vary on certain program parameters, there is general agreement among the survey respondents as to the handicapped students' learning programs. The community activities undertaken by these students are similar to those of other students in EBCE. Almost all handicapped students have some kind of community experience (field trips or short visits at the workplace), and 82% of the programs reported that all of their handicapped students do planned learning projects which include lengthy community involvement. All programs send these students into the community on an individual basis; some supplement this with group visits. Handicapped students in all 56 programs have completely individualized curricula. While some programs are limited to giving career exploration credit, 70% provide at least some required academic credit for EBCE activities. Eighty-six

percent of the respondents said that their EBCE program presented more opportunities for handicapped students to develop life skills than did the students' previous learning programs.

When respondents were asked about changes necessary to serve handicapped students in EBCE, those most frequently mentioned were adaptations in materials (54% of programs), more advance work with community resources (43%), more staff time per pupil (30%), and arrangements for transportation to sites (18%). Responses to a question regarding concerns about serving handicapped students in EBCE often mirrored these necessary changes. Other related concerns cited were the need for additional funding, the need for supplementary materials, the placement of some students at community sites, and staff flexibility.

When asked about their program's successes, respondents generally cited student gains. Most frequently mentioned were the handicapped students' enhanced self-concept, growth in life skills, exposure to the community (which resulted in increased career awareness and job skills), and acceptance by adults in the community and by peers. All respondents said that they are committed to the concept of serving handicapped students in EBCE, and most added that, given enough time, energy, and money, it is quite feasible to meet those students' educational needs through the EBCE program.

Implications for Future Research

This survey has presented information on the extent to which handicapped students are participating in EBCE programs. It established that 56 programs (of 173 programs nationwide) have served and/or now serve handicapped students. On the basis of this study, it appears likely that further inquiry would locate

additional programs (of the 173) that are now working with these students.* Information gathered from other programs would provide an even clearer picture of the use of EBCE to meet the needs of handicapped students.

The unanimity of opinion regarding the learning experiences of handicapped students may reflect the difficulty of obtaining in-depth information about the nature of the programs through a telephone interview. A different technique, such as on-site observation, might determine more exactly the variety of experiences available to these students and the extent of their participation. Respondents made it clear that they see handicapped students as being able to participate in and profit from EBCE activities. The use of a methodology designed for more in-depth data collection could provide practitioners with information which would help facilitate their own work in this area.

*In fact, the State of Maine has recently provided funding to establish or extend EBCE to handicapped high school students. More than 10 programs are involved in this effort. However, none of these were operating with handicapped youngsters in spring, 1979; thus, they were not included in this survey.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baker, R., Spotts, R., & Webb, M. Improving youth employment programs through Experience-Based Career Education: A prospectus for linking education and work. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1977.
- Baker, R., and Webb, M. Youth, work, and community-based learning: A guide to program implementation. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1979.
- Christensen, P. & Johnson, J. The learning coordinator: A study of the role. San Francisco: Experience-Based Career Education Project, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1977.
- Corder, R. External evaluators' final report on the EBCE programs. Vol. I: Summary evaluation of four Experience-Based Career Education schools. Berkeley, Ca: Educational Testing Service, 1977.
- Evenson, J., & Spotts, R., Implementing experience-based career education for handicapped students: A mainstreaming approach. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1979.
- Evenson, J., Spotts, R., & Perencivic, P. Extending experience-based career education to handicapped students: An overview of the mainstreaming approach. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1979.
- Jenks, C. Guide to adoption and implementation decisions. San Francisco: Experience-Based Career Education Project, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1977.
- Johnson, J. ERCE: The Far West model, a program overview (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1975.
- National Institute of Education. A comparison of four Experience-Based Career Education programs. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education, 1976.
- Spotts, R., & Evenson, J. Experience-Based Career Education, evaluation of outcomes at three pilot programs, 1976-77. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1977.
- Spotts, P., Evenson, J., & Blackwell, L. Experience-Based Career Education, evaluation of the Greenhouse program, 1977-78. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1978.
- Spotts, R., & Hampson, R. National directory of ERCE programs, 1979. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1979.

Watkins, R., & Jenks, C. Values and information: An approach to evaluation planning. San Francisco: Experience-Based Career Education Project, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1976.

Webb, M. and Baker, R. Expanding the employment opportunities of high-risk youth through a community-based learning program. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1979.

APPENDIX 1

EBCE NATIONAL DIRECTORY REVISION, 1979

EBCE NATIONAL DIRECTORY REVISION, 1979

COL. 1-2 STATE: _____

COL. 3-4 CITY/TOWN/COMMUNITY: _____

NAME OF PROGRAM : _____

COMMUNITY SETTING OF THE PROGRAM

Col. 5-8

Population Density (check all those that describe the location of a program site(s))

- 1 ☐ Urban, central city: in the densely-settled area of a city of 50,000 or more
- 2 ☐ Other urban: in the residential fringe area of a city of 50,000 or more
- 3 ☐ Rural, non-farm: in a town of less than 50,000
- 4 ☐ Rural, farm: in an agricultural area
- 5 ☐ Other (describe):

Col. 9

Family Income (check one)

- 1 ☐ Mostly high-income families
- 2 ☐ Mix of high- and middle-income families
- 3 ☐ Mostly middle-income families
- 4 ☐ Mix of middle- and low-income families
- 5 ☐ Mostly low-income families
- 6 ☐ Wide range of family incomes with no clear dominance

Col. 10 Prevalent Ethnic Representation (check one)

- 1 ☐ One ethnic group
- 2 ☐ Two ethnic groups
- 3 ☐ More than two ethnic groups

Col. 11 Family Mobility (check one)

- 1 ☐ Substantial number of transient families; related to seasonal work opportunities
- 2 ☐ Substantial number of transient families; related to factors other than seasonal work opportunities
- 3 ☐ Not a substantial number of transient families

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Col. 12 Principal Basis (check one)

- 1 ☐ AEL Model
- 2 ☐ FWL Model
- 3 ☐ NWREL Model
- 4 ☐ RBS Model
- 5 ☐ Other Describe: _____
- _____

Col. 13 Fidelity (check one)

- 1 ☐ Replication or only slight adaptation of the full model upon which it is based
- 2 ☐ Substantial modification of the model upon which it is based
- 3 ☐ Incorporation of only some of the features of one or more EBCE models
- 4 ☐ Other Describe: _____
- _____

Col. 14-16

Age Groups of Students (check all that apply)

- 1 ☐ Elementary school age
- 2 ☐ Middle school or junior high school age
- 3 ☐ High school age
- 4 ☐ College (immediate post-high school) age
- 5 ☐ Adult
- 6 ☐ Other Describe: _____
- _____

Col. 17

Program Emphasis

- 1 ☐ Emphasis is on serving the general school population
- 2 ☐ Emphasis is on serving the general school population, but also enroll students with special need(s). (see the next item for examples)
- 3 ☐ Emphasis is on serving students with special need(s), but also enroll other students
- 4 ☐ Enrollment is limited to students with special need(s)

Col. 18-21

Special Students Whose Needs are Served by the Program
(check all that apply)

- 1 ☐ Handicapped
- 2 ☐ Gifted/talented
- 3 ☐ Disaffected
- 4 ☐ Migrant
- 5 ☐ Youth status offenders (e.g., truants, runaways)
- 6 ☐ CETA-eligible (poverty-level)
- 7 ☐ Unemployed or education drop-outs
- 8 ☐ Pregnant teenagers or teenage parents
- 9 ☐ Other: _____

Col. 22

Proportion of Students' Curriculum Spent in EBCE-Related Activities (check one)

- 1 ☐ Part of daily (or weekly) curriculum
- 2 ☐ Full curriculum
- 3 ☐ Both part and full curriculum options available

Col. 23

Breadth of Credit Available for Experience-Based Learning
(check one)

- 1 ☐ Career exploration (or equivalent) credit available only
- 2 ☐ Career exploration and basic skills credits available only
- 3 ☐ Career exploration and elective academic credits available
- 4 ☐ Career exploration, elective and some required academic credits available
- 5 ☐ Other (specify): _____

Col. 24 Length of Program (check one)

- 1 ☐ Enrollment limited to 1 semester
- 2 ☐ Enrollment limited to 1 year or less
- 3 ☐ Enrollment limited to 2 years or less
- 4 ☐ Enrollment allowed for more than 2 years
- 5 ☐ Other (specify): _____

Col. 25 Administrative and Physical Description (check one)

- 1 ☐ Separate facility and institutional identity
- 2 ☐ Administratively separate but physically co-located with another school
- 3 ☐ Department of the school (or alternative school)
- 4 ☐ Part of a school learning facility (e.g., Career Center)
- 5 ☐ Class in the school
- 6 ☐ Teaching strategy infused into the school curriculum

Col. 26 Number of program sites

Staff (enter number)

Col. 27-28 ☐ Full-time Instructional Staff Members

Col. 29-30 ☐ Part-time or volunteer Instructional Staff Members

Current Enrollment (enter number)

Col. 31-33 ☐ Male

Col. 34-36 ☐ Female

Col. 37-39 ☐ Total

COST AND FUNDING

Col. 40

Cost (after start-up) (check one)

- 1 ☐ Not appropriate to compare cost with any other school program
- 2 ☐ Less than or equal to the per-pupil cost that would be associated with a regular program for these students
- 3 ☐ Somewhat greater than the per-pupil cost that would be associated with a regular program for these students
- 4 ☐ Substantially greater than the per-pupil cost that would be associated with a regular program for these students
- 5 ☐ Data not yet available
- 6 ☐ Other Describe: _____
- _____

Col. 41

Funding (check one)

- 1 ☐ Entirely (or almost entirely) from general funds available to schools
- 2 ☐ General funds supplemented by special-purpose monies
- 3 ☐ Mostly or entirely special-purpose monies
- 4 ☐ Other Describe: _____
- _____

For complete information of the program, contact:

Name: _____

Title: _____

Address: _____

City/town/community: _____

State/Zip Code: _____

Telephone: _____

APPENDIX 2

PARTICIPATION OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS IN EBCE

PARTICIPATION OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS IN EBCE

SITE ID _____

Respondent _____ Date _____

Title of respondent _____ Time _____

Telephone # () _____

PART ONE: RESPONDENTS FROM ALL PROGRAMS

Introduction

MY NAME IS _____. I'M CALLING FROM FAR WEST
LABORATORY IN SAN FRANCISCO. AS YOU KNOW, WE ARE COMPLETING WORK ON THE
NATIONAL DIRECTORY OF EBCE SITES -- YOU SHOULD BE RECEIVING A COPY WITHIN
THE NEXT FEW WEEKS.

WE ARE DOING A FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF EBCE PROGRAMS INDICATING ON THE DIRECTORY
QUESTIONNAIRE THAT THEY MIGHT SERVE HANDICAPPED STUDENTS. THIS IS A SEPARATE
EFFORT FROM THE DIRECTORY. OUR PURPOSES ARE TO COLLECT MORE INFORMATION ABOUT
WHAT EBCE PROGRAMS ARE DOING WITH HANDICAPPED STUDENTS AND TO MAKE THIS INFORMA-
TION AVAILABLE IN A PAPER TO BE PUBLISHED LATER THIS YEAR.

WE WOULD GREATLY APPRECIATE YOUR TAKING A FEW MINUTES NOW TO ANSWER SOME
QUESTIONS -- IF THIS IS NOT A CONVENIENT TIME, MAY WE ARRANGE A TIME TO CALL
BACK? THE QUESTIONS SHOULD TAKE ABOUT FIFTEEN MINUTES.

Call-Back: Time _____ Date: _____

- If yes: fill in chart.

- If yes: fill in chart.

[illegible]

Comments:

52

2. What is the likelihood that your program will enroll handicapped students later this year?

☐ likely ☐ unlikely ☐ don't know

Comments:

3. We're interested in your program's view of the amount of planning and preparation considered necessary for enrolling handicapped students in LBCL. I'll read you two alternatives. Could you tell me which comes closer to your program's viewpoint?

☐ Little preplanning, can accept students and make necessary adaptations as go along.

☐ Thorough preplanning, almost everything worked out before accepting students.

Comments:

IF STUDENTS ENROLLED (yes on 1A) - GO TO PART TWO.

4. In what areas, if any, are you now engaging in preparation for enrolling handicapped students?

THANK THESE RESPONDENTS, ASK FOR OTHER COMMENTS, AND CLOSE.

PART TWO: RESPONDENTS FROM THOSE PROGRAMS ENROLLING HANDICAPPED STUDENTS

5. What differences, if any, do you see in your program from one that does not enroll handicapped students?

Probe for adaptations and changes (e.g. materials, staff, kinds of community-resources).

6. We are interested in what handicapped students do in your program.

- A. Generally, what proportion of these students' curriculum is spent in EBCE-related activities? (check one)

- ☐ Part of their daily (or weekly) curriculum
☐ All of their curriculum
☐ Both part-time and full-time curriculum options are available

- B. What kind of credit is available to handicapped students? (check one)

- ☐ Career exploration (or equivalent) credit available only.
☐ Career exploration and basic skills credits available only.
☐ Career exploration and elective academic credits available.
☐ Career exploration, elective and some required academic credits available.
☐ OTHER (Specify): _____

7. We are interested in the kind of community experiences your program makes available for handicapped students.

A. How many of your handicapped students will have experiences in the community through EBCE?

all or nearly all _____

some _____

hardly any or none _____

B. In your EBCE program do students, including handicapped students, visit community sites in:

	<u>Check if YES</u>	<u>Ranking</u>
large groups	_____	_____
small groups of 3 or 4	_____	_____
pairs	_____	_____
individually	_____	_____

Please rank from highest (1) to lowest (4) the emphasis in your program on these modes of visits.

Comments:

C. What opportunities will your handicapped students have to explore careers in the community? (circle appropriate number)

	<u>No Students</u>	<u>Some Students</u>	<u>Most Students</u>	<u>All Students</u>
Field trip or visit to an organization	1	2	3	4
Short visit with a person at his/her workplace	1	2	3	4
Lengthy visit with a person at his/her workplace including planned activities.	1	2	3	4

Comments:

8. We are interested in the handicapped student in your program as an individual.

A. Is each handicapped student's learning program individualized to his or her particular needs?

Yes _____

No _____

Comments:

B. Who makes the decisions about what activities will be in a handicapped student's learning program?

mostly a staff decision _____

mostly the student's decision _____

C. Who has the responsibility for arranging a student's visits to community sites?

mostly staff's responsibility _____

mostly the student's responsibility _____

D. Who has the responsibility for arranging a student's transportation to and from sites?

mostly staff's responsibility _____

mostly the student's responsibility _____

E. For handicapped students, how do the opportunities in your EBCE program to develop life skills (such as self-reliance and decision-making) compare with those of other programs enrolling handicapped students in your district?

greater opportunity in EBCE _____

about the same opportunity in EBCE _____

less opportunity in EBCE _____

Comments:

9. Generally, how would you judge the acceptance of the handicapped students in your program? (circle the appropriate number for each)

	Awkward			Excellent
A. by resource persons	1	2	3	4
B. by other EBCE students	1	2	3	4

10. What do you feel have been your program's greatest areas of success with handicapped students?

11. What are your current areas of concern about serving handicapped students in your program?

THANK THE RESPONDENT, ASK IF THERE IS ANYTHING HE/SHE WOULD LIKE TO ADD.

Comments: